UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/771,570	02/04/2004	W. Curt Lefebvre	NC9441US	3723
22203 KUSNER & JA	7590 02/22/200 .FFE	3	EXAMINER	
	LACE SUITE 310		VIZVARY, GERALD C	
6151 WILSON MILLS ROAD HIGHLAND HEIGHTS, OH 44143			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3696	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/22/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary		10/771,570	LEFEBVRE ET AL	L.			
		Examiner	Art Unit				
		GERALD C. VIZVARY	3696				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication appropriate or Reply	opears on the cover sheet wi	th the correspondence ad	ldress			
WHIC - Exter after - If NC - Failu Any r	CRTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING I nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. To period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period to tee to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statuted teeply received by the Office later than three months after the mailined patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC .136(a). In no event, however, may a red will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON te, cause the application to become AB	CATION. eply be timely filed ITHS from the mailing date of this of the company				
Status							
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>2/2</u>	/2004					
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		is action is non-final.					
3)	/ —		ers prosecution as to the	e merits is			
٥,١	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Dispositi	on of Claims		,				
		_					
•	Claim(s) <u>1-23</u> is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
		awn irom consideration.					
•	5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
	Claim(s) is/are rejected.						
•	Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) 🔀	Claim(s) <u>1-23</u> are subject to restriction and/or	r election requirement.					
Applicati	on Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.							
10)	10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.						
•	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.							
Priority ເ	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119						
a)[Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents. Certified copies of the priority documents. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents. Copies of the certified copies of the prince application from the International Burestee the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. nts have been received in A ority documents have been au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	pplication No received in this National	Stage			
2) Notic 3) Inform	t(s) e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s	Summary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date nformal Patent Application 				

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-23 are pending in the instant application, filed 2/2/2004.

Election/Restrictions

- 2. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - I. Claims 1-6 & 18-22, drawn to a method of modeling business processes used to assign credit, are classified in class 705, subclass 35.
 - II. Claims 13-17, drawn to a method for implementing a network of interconnected business processes are classified in class 707, subclass 10.
 - III. Claims 14-17, drawn to a system of distributed process control of interconnected processes using a plurality of management modules, are classified in class 709, subclass 205.
 - IV. Claim 23, drawn to a system of process management of interconnected processes, is classified in class 709, subclass 230.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

3. Inventions I and II are related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. The subcombinations are distinct if they do not overlap in scope and are not obvious variants and if it is shown that at least one subcombination is separately usable. In the instant case, subcombination II has separate utility such as using a plurality of management computers to implement a mathematical model. See MPEP § 806.05(d).

- 4. Inventions III and IV are related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. The subcombinations are distinct if they do not overlap in scope and are not obvious variants and if it is shown that at least one subcombination is separately usable. In the instant case, subcombination IV has separate utility such as a general process management system. See MPEP § 806.05(d).
- 5. Inventions I and III are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product. See MPEP § 806.05(h). In the instant case the method of I could be performed by other conceivable systems than that of III, while the system of III could run other methods than that of I. Similarly the same applies to I and IV.
- 6. The examiner has required restriction between subcombinations usable together. Where applicant elects a subcombination and claims thereto are subsequently found allowable, any claim(s) depending from or otherwise requiring all the limitations of the allowable subcombination will be examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. See MPEP § 821.04(a). Applicant is advised that if any claim presented in a continuation or divisional application is anticipated by, or includes all the limitations of, a claim that is allowable in the present application, such claim may be subject to

provisional statutory and/or nonstatutory double patenting rejections over the claims of

the instant application.

7. The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims.

Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are

subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise

require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder.

All claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of

an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

8. In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product

claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process

claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to

be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the

requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product

are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product

claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not

commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP

§ 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the

above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during

prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result

in a loss of the right to rejoinder. Further, note that the prohibition against double

Page 4

Art Unit: 3696

patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement

is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01. Any inquiry

concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be

directed to GERALD C. VIZVARY whose telephone number is (571)270-3268. The

examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Tom Dixon can be reached on 571-272-6803. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published

applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status

information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For

more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you

have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business

Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO

Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call

800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Ella Colbert/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3696
